



Superintendent  
of Documents

# ADMINISTRATIVE NOTES



## LIBRARY PROGRAMS SERVICE

Vol. 6, No. 10

GP 3.16/3-2:6/10

July 1985

### NEW CLAIM PERIOD FOR GPO/USGS/DMA MAP PROGRAM

The 60-day period for claiming USGS and DMA maps shown on shipping lists but not received has been changed on a temporary basis. Until further notice, please do not mail claims to USGS within 60 days; rather, mail them 60 to 90 days AFTER the date of the shipping list. When USGS is able to include shipping lists with the maps, the 60-day claim period will be put back into effect. Remember, the new claim period applies only to the GPO/USGS/DMA map program.

\*\*\*\*\*

### SELECTION UPDATE CYCLE 1985-#2

The Library Programs Service (LPS) implemented Selection Update cycle 1985-#2 on June 24, 1985, for 99.8 percent of the active item numbers. This implementation was completed six weeks earlier than the scheduled date of August 5th.

There are still 13 automatic/direct mail item numbers for which selections have not yet been updated. LPS is waiting for an enhancement to the Depository Distribution and Information System (DDIS) and the Mail List System before completing the update cycle. The enhancement is on track and scheduled for completion August 5, 1985. It is in the best interests of all involved to wait for this enhancement and accomplish the work through an automatic transfer of selection information by computer programs rather than invest the manual effort to complete the same task. The manual method would probably take longer than six weeks to conclude.

LPS mailed a report, the Amendment to Selections, informing those libraries of selection additions and deletions recorded for the recent update cycle, including items selected from surveys 84-9 through 85-2, which are noted with an asterisk.

Thank you for your assistance in completing this recent update; the 1985-#3 update cycle is scheduled to begin in October 1985.

\*\*\*\*\*

### RESULTS OF SENATE NUMBERING SURVEY

567 libraries, or 40.8% of the total of 1388 depositories, have responded to the Senate numbering survey. The results are as follows:

Continue use of Senate numbering .....	330
Return to use of Committee/Cutter numbering.	211
Other .....	22
No box checked .....	4

In light of these results, no changes are contemplated, and the Senate numbers will continue to be used in SuDocs classes for Senate materials. For comments received on this issue, see page 2.

## COMMENTS

Besides a variety of emphatic exclamation points, underlinings, stars, and circles, quite a number of survey responses contained additional comments and suggestions. These are all reproduced below, both to show the range of opinion on this issue, and because some of the ideas on handling Senate materials may be useful in depository libraries.

Comments on votes to continue Senate numbering:

- Too confusing to return to the former system.
- Whatever you decide, please keep the same format. Consistency is vital. Changing back and forth confuses library users.
- Frankly, it truly does not matter how these are classified so long as they are indexed such that the patrons are able to locate what they need. I do wish that you would stop changes such as these which go back and forth from [one] numbering system to another which only serves to confuse, create grossly unnecessary amounts of paper work and harass/inflame already overworked librarians.
- We have shifted our collection based on the premise that documents would be added only at the end of the class number and not throughout the entire class as with cutter numbers. A change at this point would mean shifting our entire Senate hearings again.
- Although it was easier to file by the old scheme -- why change again & add more confusion.
- I definitely prefer a Sudoc # that has the no. of the Congress on it. That way we know when the last one for the year comes in. And since we have them arranged by Senate Hearings and Senate Prints for the past year I would like to keep them that way. It is this rearranging the stacks that take so much time and explaining.
- Cuttering just leads to more shipping list problems & errors.
- Although the old Cutter system allowed educated guesses by key term and facilitated browsing, the new system has the advantages of:
  - allowing for shelf growth on a more predictable basis
  - saving time at GPO (I think) in classification activities
  - not being a dual system of either # or letter following the colon.
 We don't need yet another change! Please treat House materials in the same way as the new Senate system.
- It would have helped to leave well enough alone in the first place, but will cause much havoc if return to the old system now since we have all had to organize our files with the new system.
- Most requests are made through this numbering system. Only librarians can understand a cutter number. The easiest access for the patron is what we should be aiming for.
- Please do not change again.
- Once you change something, please carefully reconsider changing back. This confuses other librarians and staff!

- We've been a depository only 2 yrs. but already have 2 major numbering sequences. I don't like the Senate scheme, but a switch would give us 3 sequences. Cure worse than disease.
- The sooner all House hearings and prints follow suit, the better!
- I would be thrilled if numbering of House committee hearings and prints used the same format as the Senate. Also, I am very much in favor of keeping the Senate numbering system because it makes space planning, shifting, and shelving more straightforward.
- When you come up with a new system for Documents -- stick with it. It is extremely frustrating to change from one system to another and flop back at a later date. The numbering of the Census Bureau, shipping lists and now this -- stick to one scheme and LEAVE IT!!!!
- We would vote for a return to the old Cuttering system only if you re-classed all the ones sent under the Senate numbering system.
- Please don't keep changing the system. It disrupts the concept of locating the materials according to the philosophy of the SuDoc system.
- PLEASE don't change back to the old system unless you "correct" all the items classed under the new system for the 98th and 99th Congresses. The new system is not particularly good or bad, but changing back & then forth is terrible.
- Whatever you do, make a decision and stick to it. Quit changing back and forth and shilly-shallying around.
- We love it!! Much easier!! Please keep -- thank you.
- I also wish you would do the same for House documents -- i.e.  
Y 4.F 76/1:H.hrg.99-1.
- This is a good way to know if an item has not been received and easier to know how much shelf space is necessary. Cuttering is always a guess. I don't want the J-- used for Senate Judiciary.
- Should be same system for both Houses of Congress.
- Wish House hearings & comm. prints were done this way, too.
- Use the same system for House materials & publish the same kind of list.
- Introduce House numbering!
- Please, continue use of the Senate numbering system for hearings. The changeover from Cuttering with the 98th Congress caused shelving problems. The student assistants had a hard time becoming used to shelving at the end of the Cuttered publications. Now that plenty of hearings are in, shelving is easy ...Continued use of the Senate numbering system has one other benefit. It's easy to locate a new hearing as yet unindexed by looking through the most recent publications of the committee. It's not possible to do this with Cuttered publications. Please, don't change back again to the former system. It would just mean more headaches now that we have become accustomed to the Senate number.



## Comments on votes to return to Committee/Cutter numbering:

- More consistent with finding aids: CIS, Monthly Catalog.
- Senate numbering causes search difficulties for online catalogs. Most (or nearly all) patrons would have no idea numbering had changed & would therefore not be able to search by SuDoc #. Most people also do not know what hrg. or prt. are. More attention needs to be paid to library users, not librarians.
- Committee numbers are the simplest to check in.
- What would be most appreciated is 1) sticking to one numbering system and most importantly 2) surveying depository libraries prior to instituting a major change such as this.
- [return], unless the House adopts a similar numbering scheme.
- [return], but assign serial nos. to all pubs and eliminate Cutter numbers (tell the Senate to change its numbering system).
- The ideal situation would be for all committees to use a straight numbering system (i.e., 99-1, 99-2, etc.)
- It is requested that there be more consistency in cuttering so that different editions, or worse, volumes of same hearing are not separated.
- Please reclass the current hearings (Y 4.En 2:S.hrg.98-997) so we won't have the interim group off by itself.
- Committee/Cutter no. simplifies the system.
- Prefer Committee number to Cuttering -- if that not possible for all continue Senate numbering.
- Cuttering brings items on a subject together on the shelf.
- The use of Committee number only or Cutter only would be even better!
- [Senate numbering] has caused some shelving problems. It has been difficult to teach my assistant to shelve and file them properly. We had less problems the old way.
- The use of a committee number alone would be fine, in fact, preferable. The problem with the present numbering system is 1) that many check cards are needed in the shelflist and 2) that it is hard to determine if publications are missing or holdings incomplete except by checking the lists in Administrative Notes.
- 1) Given a request by title and no call number, cutter nos. makes them easy to retrieve by educated guessing. 2) Cuttering often puts similar topics in same area which the patron might find useful but otherwise would not have found.
- The Senate numbering creates difficulties in shelving, in that the numbers for a particular committee are not consecutive and don't always know how many spaces to leave on shelflist between hearings.
- ...[Library] wholeheartedly supports the use of Committee/Cutter numbering and urges GPO to return to its use. If GPO returns to the Committee/Cutter numbering, we urge that the Senate hearings, etc., from the 98th

Congress be reissued under the former numbering system. This will enable depository libraries to have a complete collection of Senate materials numbered in one system rather than having the documents from the 98th Congress as an anomaly.

Comments on votes for "other":

- Has made no difference to us.
- Continue Senate numbering but place words "S.hrg." or "S.prt." after number, eg. Y 4.En 2:98-997 (S.hrg.). Otherwise growth space has to be allowed for in middle of previous "cuttered alphabet."
- The original system was by far the better. For the system to change again, however, would produce an even more confusing system, unless GPO can reclassify the hearings that were given the Senate numbering back into the original system, or at least provide guidelines for depositories to do so.
- I want as much consistency as possible. If the Senate has no plans to change its numbering system retain the current system. If the Senate will be doing a lot of system changing return to the Committee/Cutter system.
- I would prefer numbering each Committee's publications separately.
- I offer the alternative of returning to a system used by some committees in the past that has a serial numbering system for each committee. In other words, with each Senate Committee root number in the SuDocs classification system there would be a serial numbering system for that committee. This would work out whether or not the committee assigned serial numbers to its publications. GPO could number them as they were received for classification. This system would also make more sense because this serial system would more naturally follow the previous misguided Senate numbering system. This would be much easier to shelve and keep in some semblance of order on the shelves. After all, we do use the numbering system to shelve and access the hearings.
- Senate numbering for hearings, Cutter for prints.
- Return to use of committee numbering, & assign consecutive numbers to committees which don't number.
- This offer to consider changing the numbering system comes far too late. In March, 1983, we voiced our concerns in a two-page letter to Ms. Sandra Peterson. We detailed the confusion we thought would (and did) result. If action were to be taken, it should have been in 1983. As it is, changing to the original numbering system without renumbering the old Senate documents will pile on more.
- For the sake of consistency and convenience in planning storage, I would prefer that all Senate documents be assigned consecutive Committee numbers and Cutter numbers be abandoned.
- Numbering system should be used by every Committee of both House and Senate.
- Senate numbering -- it's useless! Only advantage is ease in filing. Committee/Cutter numbering -- this is better but different systems are confusing. Prefer Cutter: a) it groups like materials together, b) it's consistent from Congress to Congress and Committee to Committee, c) makes

it possible to by-pass index for access.

- I would prefer a return to the use of Committee/Cutter numbering system only if those documents issued under the Senate numbering system could be reclassified to fit into the Committee/Cutter numbering system. If this is not possible then I prefer to remain with the use of the Senate numbering system, knowing that at least documents after a certain date would be found in one place rather than in a number of locations within the SuDocs scheme.
- Makes no difference to us. We arrange by committee, & then title.
- Continue using Senate nos. but drop "S.hrg." "S.prt." etc. unless duplicate numbers fall under same committee then qualify after the number /hr. or /prt.
- Continue Senate numbering for most, but use Cutter numbers for specific continuing series, to keep them together.
- Keep the Senate numbering, but use H or P instead of awkward S.hrg. or S.prt. They are all Senate Committees, thus the S. is not needed.  
Example: Y 4.En 2:H-98-997. Y 4.F 76/2:P-98-237.
- Rather than numbering for the Senate as a whole, number by Committee.
- Have you considered the possibility of using a simple accession number system? Could start each year as illustrated in the following example: For 1985 hearings, prints and miscellaneous publications of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Y 4.En 2:985-1 (first title pub. in 1985); Y 4.En 2:985-2 (second title pub. in 1985) ... Using a "potage" of different types of numbers (H.Rpt. vs. H.Hrg. vs. cutter # vs. Cong.#/sess.) is extremely confusing to student shelvees and the public when trying to locate the titles in question.
- Assign a committee # for each series -- have no cuttered numbers, but each committee to have its own numbered series.

Comments on forms on which no option was voted for:

- Cutter numbers are so very useful that ALL committees should be assigned Cutter numbers. This is because the Cutter number places ALL the hearings on ONE subject of a committee on ONE place on the library shelves. It is of great reference value to have all hearings on Electronic Funds Transfers of the Senate Banking Committee in one place. When a library patron finds the Sudoc number of one hearing on a subject, he is led to all the earlier and later hearings held on the subject. The Cutter number is of great reference value to the Documents Librarian while the Committee's number is just a location symbol.
- I'd go either option. Option one makes it easier to plan shelving; option two puts like materials together. Both have good and bad points.
- We can live with either method now that we have the shelflist cards set up.



THE SENATE NUMBERING SCHEME REVIEWED: A STATEMENT FOR THE  
DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL, BY JOHN A. McGEACHY

Many of the following points will be generally known to those dealing regularly with the Senate numbering scheme for hearings, prints, and publications adopted by GPO for use on items beginning with the 98th Congress. After two years' experience with the Senate scheme, it is time for a review of its impact on depositories.

1. Sequence of call number elements.

Call number construction should proceed from general to more specific elements. The SuDoc use of the Senate numbering scheme does not follow this principle. The class stem identifies the specific Committee, thus Senate (a more general element) is included in the class stem by implication, and is an unnecessary element in the second line of the call number.

2. Filing S.hrgs., S.prts., and S.pubs.

It is very easy to interfile these three types of documents in a single numerical sequence. The filing problem will be amplified soon. If filers strictly follow the elements of the call number, documents issued during the same Congress will be separated by more and more shelf space as time goes by. Example: a) Strict adherence to call number elements:

S.hrg.98 -- S.hrg.99 -- ... -- S.prt.98 -- S.prt.99 -- ...

b) Perhaps a more logical sequence would be:

98hr. -- 98prt. -- 98pub. -- 99hr. -- 99prt. -- ...

3. Title keyword proximity of Cuttered documents.

Formerly one could find many Cuttered Congressional hearings and prints on a certain topic in one spot within a Committee's works.

Examples: Foreign Relations Committee titles dealing with China  
would be found at Y 4.F 76/2:C 44/[no.]

Appropriation Committee Interior and related agencies  
Appropriations were always at Y 4.Ap 6/2:In 8/[date]

Now such works are arranged by an arbitrary chronological device which has even less meaning to users and requires that they consult a reference tool to find material of interest, instead of finding subject-related material grouped together.

4. Bibliographic access.

There are two common questions here. 1) Given a patron with a Senate hrg, prt, or pub number, how do you find it in the collection? 2) How do you determine if all the issuances from a Committee have been received? This second question is usually asked during the binding process for which more Senate material should be appropriate given the sequential nature of the new scheme.

Question 1: If you have a complete citation including the Committee's name, you can add the Senate number to the class stem obtained from memory or the List of classes.

Even without the name of the Committee given, if you've got the CIS index, you're in good shape because one of that tool's supplementary indexes is by Senate hrg, prt, and pub number. Of course, the citations are to CIS abstracts, so you need to look in two places before you come up with the call number.

If you use the Monthly Catalog, you're in trouble. First you need an MLS to figure out the series entry used in the Series/report number index:

United States. Congress (98th, 2d Session : 1984). Senate. S.hrg ; [no.]  
Next you have to wonder about the completeness of the Monthly Catalog's coverage. Consider these questions about the Monthly Catalog's treatment of series numbers which leave me with an uneasy feeling.

Why are some entries like the S.hrg example cited above interfiled with "... Senate. Reports" (pgs. I-2543 and 2544, 1984 MoCat index)?

Why are "S.hrg," "S.prt," and "S.pub" interfiled (pgs. I-2549 through 2555, 1984 MoCat index)? And if they are interfiled, why do the numbers not repeat themselves? Why can't you find, for example, hrg. 98-90, prt 98-90, and pub 98-90?

Instead, what you find is "print 98-1, hrg 98-2, print 98-3, print 98-4, hrg. 98-5, hrg 98-6, print 98-7, print 98-8, prt 98-9 ..." (p. I-2648, 1983 MoCat index). Is the programming allowing only one hrg, prt, or pub to be printed, not all three?

If you have done the necessary copying and filing of the numerical sequence lists which appear in Administrative Notes, you can determine the appropriate Committee from this source. Copying pages is required because often hearings will appear on the front of a sheet and prints or publications will be recorded on the back of the same sheet. An extra copy must be made to file a page in two sequences.

Question 2. A point made by GPO when it began to use the Senate numbering scheme was that volumes would file in numerical order, and collections would grow only at one spot in the holdings of each Committee. Areas of Cuttered hearings could be compacted and shelf space would be more economically used.

Using the Senate numbering scheme will allow more volumes to be bound in sets, but first it is necessary to determine whether the Committee runs are complete. In the Senate Library, hearings may be filed from S.hrg 98-1 through S.hrg 98-1100+, but in depositories this simple arrangement is scrambled by the imposition of the class stem for individual Committees. One must search some reference source to determine whether all of a Committee's works are in hand.

GPO undertook to supply depositories with Legislative calendars from Congressional Committees as a source of this information. The coverage by GPO has not been very complete.

Number of Senate Committees	20
Number of Committees for which one or more <u>calendars</u> have been supplied	11
Number of Committees for which <u>calendars</u> are up-to-date (i.e., 98th Final <u>calendar</u> received through 3/11/85)	6
Number of Committees for which no <u>calendars</u> have been supplied	9

Examination of the calendars from the 11 Committees revealed a great disparity in the listings of printed hearings, prints, and publications. Hearings are by far the most numerous.



8 calendars list hearings by date. Three of the eight list Full Committee hearings first, followed by Subcommittee hearings so there is not a single dated sequence. S.hrg numbers apparently are not assigned at the time the hearing is held so, while there is a chronological listing of printed hearings, this list does not equate to an orderly sequence of S.hrg numbers. S.hrg numbers are still scrambled.

1 calendar (Indian Affairs, for which only the Final 97th calendar is at hand) lists hearings alphabetically. S.hrg numbers would be scrambled here if a 98th calendar was available.

2 calendars list hearings by Committee serial number (Commerce, Science, Technology; and Judiciary). But as with the dated lists, the S.hrg numbers and the Committee serial numbers do not equate. An example from the Judiciary Committee:

S.hrg 98-176	=	J-98-25
S.hrg 98-182	=	J-98-13
S.hrg 98-184	=	J-98-2
S.hrg 98-191	=	J-98-29

The Senate Library produced at the end of 1983 a "cumulative listing of all Senate hearings, prints, and miscellaneous publications" "arranged by Committee and within each Committee by number." This valuable item appeared as Admin notes 5:3 (Feb. 1984); a similar compilation for 1984 has not been received. This is exactly what is called for by Question 2.

One must remember that titles which are released in parts may have been printed in both 1983 and 1984, so there may be more parts to a title than are recorded in the 1983 "cumulative listing." Such a "cumulative listing" for the second half of the 98th Congress is eagerly awaited so 1984 receipts can be bound.

Before accepting the "cumulative listing" as infallible, it proved informative to compare its listing of Committee hearings with that given in the Monthly Catalog's classification index. If the Monthly Catalog is exhaustive in its listing of Congressional titles, the two sources should be in equilibrium. 1983 hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee were chosen as a sample.

The Monthly Catalog's classification index has 12 entries for Senate Foreign Relations hearings (pg. I-2832). They are assigned S.hrg numbers between 98-2 and 98-209. For that same range of numbers, the Senate's "cumulative list" shows 15 hearings (16 if a pt. 2 is counted separately). There are more discrepancies than can be cleared up by referral to the 1984 Monthly Catalog's index.

hrg 98-61, Global economic outlook, was sent by GPO to depositories on June 3, 1983, but is in neither the 1983 or 1984 classification number index. GPO has not cataloged this hearing on OCLC, but there is an LC record (without SuDoc number) in the database.

hrg 98-141, Controlling space weapons, is not in the 1983 index, but does appear in 1984.

hrg 98-163, pt.2, Radio broadcasting to Cuba, is not in either year's index. One must consult the "cumulative listing" to ascertain the important fact that part 1 was published during the 97th Congress. It is classed at Y 4.F 76/2:C 89/9.

hrg 98-173, Executive Council on foreign diplomats, appears in the 1984 index.

hrg 98-174, pt.2, United States-Soviet relations, is also in the 1984 index.

hrg 98-209, Nomination of Hon. Millicent Fenwick, is in the "cumulative listing", but it has been incorrectly attributed to the Labor and Human Relations Committee. The Monthly Catalog is correct in its treatment of this title.

Conclusions on bibliographic access. Question 1 can be answered through the CIS index or by using a properly maintained Admin notes numerical sequence listing of Senate hearings, prints, and publications. The Monthly Catalog is virtually useless on this question. Its indexing of series numbers uses a complicated format, and appears to be very incomplete.

Question 2 causes grave problems for any librarian desiring a complete set of Senate hearings, prints, and publications. The Senate's "cumulative listing" for 1983 is not without error, nor is the Monthly Catalog exhaustive. Legislative calendars are useless to answer Question 2. There seems to be no accurate and complete source to determine the question of completeness of holdings.

##### 5. Conclusions and recommendations.

Adoption of the Senate numbering scheme may have streamlined the processing of Senate titles by GPO, and may be most useful in the Senate library, but for depositories its adoption has created serious problems. Librarians hoping to insure that their collection is complete face an extremely difficult problem, one exacerbated by the Senate numbering scheme.

GPO has also had to undertake additional duties. It must collect and distribute Legislative calendars, and it must reproduce and distribute the Senate's numerical listing of hearings, prints, and publications.

Given the above, the Depository Library Council should resist with the utmost steadfastness any suggestion by GPO to adopt any such numbering scheme for House hearings, prints, and publications.

Council and GPO must have further debate about what to do with Senate material. Three options seem to be available:

- 1) Return to the pre-98th Congress treatment: stop using S.hrg, S.prt, and S.pub numbers in SuDoc call numbers.
- 2) Use S.hrg, S.prt, and S.pub numbers, but use them with a class stem for the Senate (Y 1.5: maybe): file hearings, prints, and publications in one numerical sequence and forget the Committee association: file the material as is done in the Senate Library.
- 3) Do nothing: continue to use S.hrg, S.prt, and S.pub in association with the various Committees.

This last option seems the least satisfactory from the viewpoint of a depository librarian. Surely the new "customer-driven, service-oriented" GPO can reach a better arrangement with the depository community than the present situation.

A RESPONSE TO THE SENATE NUMBERING SCHEME REVIEWED

The paper submitted to the Spring 1985 meeting of the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer addresses four major concerns regarding the use of the Senate numbering in Superintendent of Documents classification numbers for Senate publications. These concerns are, first, redundancy in the use of the "S." in the designation preceding the Senate number; second, difficulty in filing the publications in a collection; third, separation of materials on similar topics. The fourth concern is divided into two parts: one, difficulty in finding a publication in a collection when only the Senate number is known; and second, difficulty in determining when a collection is complete.

In response to the first point, GPO has considered the designations S. prt., S. hrg., and S. pub. to be single integral units, and has therefore transcribed the entire designation, including the "S.", in the classification number. This usage may present filing difficulties in individual libraries, which is the second issue raised in the paper. A number of filing arrangements are possible, and several are outlined in the paper. Any filing system will have desirable and less desirable effects, and each library must choose the system that works best with its own collection, staff, and users. The GPO shelflist is filed in the sequence S. hrg. 98- , S. hrg. 99- , S. prt. 98- , S. prt. 99- , etc. However, a library wishing to keep materials from each Congress together would file in the sequence S. hrg. 98- , S. prt. 98- , S. pub. 98- , S. hrg. 99- , S. prt. 99- , S. pub. 99- , etc. Whatever filing system is chosen, some materials will be separated that would be brought together under another system.

The third point made in the paper is that with the use of the Senate numbering in the SuDocs classification number, materials on one subject are no longer brought together by Cutter numbers. GPO's position is that Cuttering is a subjective and error-prone process, and it is used to classify documents only as a last resort, when there is no series numbering available. Before the Senate numbering system was devised, Serial numbers were transcribed in the SuDocs classification numbers for those Committee documents that used them. Cutter numbers were not uniformly used for Senate publications before the 98th Congress, nor are they used elsewhere in the SuDocs classification system where series numbers are available. The purpose of the SuDocs classification system is to give every document a unique number, not to bring together documents by subject matter.

The fourth point, regarding bibliographic access, is the major one raised in the paper. It is presented in two parts. The first part deals with the question of access to a document when only the Senate number is known. The second part raises the question of whether it is possible to determine when all the Senate publications of a particular Congress have been received.

In the discussion of access in the paper it is pointed out that the CIS Index includes a supplementary index for the Senate numbers, and access using this index is relatively simple. Using the Monthly Catalog series index is more confusing, the paper points out, because of several anomalies in the way that



index is constructed. Series titles falling under the corporate heading for each Congress are interfiled and are listed in one numerical sequence. In addition, each number is printed only once, but all the records using that number are listed under that entry. For example, in the series index of the 1983 cumulative index to the Monthly Catalog, the entry "United States. Congress (98th, 1st session ; 1983). Senate. S.hrg. ; 98-5" lists two entry numbers, 83-16548 and 83-16587. Entry number 83-16548 is for S. hrg. 98-5, and entry number 83-16587 is for S. prt. 98-5. In order to find the entry for a Senate publication when only the Senate number is known, it is therefore necessary to search under the corporate heading for the Congress in the series index, and then to look up each entry listed under the appropriate Senate number to discover the SuDocs classification number. As the paper points out, the Senate's list of publications which appears in Administrative Notes is a useful finding aid, since it lists the publications by number and shows the issuing Committee for each. Once the issuing Committee and the Senate number are known, constructing the SuDocs class number is a simple operation with the use of the List of Classes. When the title and the issuing Committee are not known, the Senate numbering improves bibliographic access by providing an additional access point that was previously non-existent.

Part two of the fourth point poses the question of how, given the use of Senate numbering in the SuDocs class, may one know when a collection is complete for a particular Congress. Various bibliographic tools are cited, and the paper concludes that there is "no accurate and complete source to determine the question of completeness of holdings." It is further stated that "Librarians hoping to insure that their collection is complete face an extremely difficult problem, one exacerbated by the Senate numbering scheme."

It should be recognized from the outset that it is not the function of the SuDocs classification system to show completeness of holdings for the publications of any agency. However, because of the sequential nature of the Senate numbering system, and because of the list supplied by the Senate Library and printed in Administrative Notes, it is now actually easier to determine whether all Senate publications issued to date have been acquired than was formerly the case. A cumulative listing of all publications issued to date will not show how many publications are still to be published, however. Those familiar with Congressional publications know that some hearings, for example, may be published well after the end of the Congress in which the hearings were held.

The paper concludes with three options presented for consideration. The first is to return to classifying Senate documents as they were prior to the 98th Congress. The second is to put all Senate publications under one class stem and use the Senate numbering in one numerical sequence. The third is to continue to use the Senate numbering in the class under the class stems for the Committees, as is done at present. The Library Programs Service has surveyed the depository libraries on their preferences, and the results are shown on page 1 of this issue of Administrative Notes.